SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

25th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXV, No. 10 | P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015 | © June 1, 1995

Does Doomsday Loom For The Social Sciences at NSF?

Efforts were still under way last week to sort out a Congressional threat to discontinue the National Science Foundation's support for the social, behavioral, and economic sciences.

The disciplines, lumped together in a single NSF Directorate referred to as SBE, understandably regard the termination possibility as chilling, since the $85 million a year supplied by NSF is the mainstay of academic funding in these fields. But a lot of fog still surrounds the cutoff reports, and there's a long way to go in the appropriations process.

In response to the threat of termination, statements of outrage and pleas for reconsideration have been emanating from the Washington outposts of the social sciences. And NSF Director Neal Lane, who has issued a cautiously mild protest, hopes to discuss the matter next week with House Science Committee Chairman Robert Walker (R-Pa.), whose casual remarks about the social sciences set off the alarm.

American Psychological Assn. Settles With Ex-Science Chief for $80,000—P. 6

Walker raised the issue, though in somewhat confusing terms, at a press briefing on May 11 concerning the House Budget Resolution and the effects it would have on NSF and other agencies in his Committee's jurisdiction [SGR, May 15: "GOP Plan Favors Science, Cuts Heavily Into Technology"].

Walker commands attention on these matters because he is also Vice Chairman of the Budget Committee and a longtime buddy of Speaker Gingrich, as well as a self-proclaimed research enthusiast. Discussing the Budget Resolution, he noted with pride that "Basic research is protected." Growth of the NSF budget, he said, would proceed at an annual 3 percent pace, to which he added: "with the exclusion of social, behavioral, and economic studies, and the Critical Technologies Institute," a RAND contractor that works for the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Asked about the exclusion of the social, behavioral, and economic sciences, Walker, a rapid and somewhat excitable talker, replied [as taped and transcribed by SGR]: "In large part, we think that's an area where we think the National Science Foundation has largely wandered into those areas in recent years, that was a kind of politically correct decision in recent years."

Dismissing the Critical Technologies Institute as "corporate welfare," Walker said, "So any reductions in spending that you see for NSF reflect those two policy decisions." He

(Continued on Page 4)

47 Witnesses, 3-Week Appeal Slated in "Baltimore" Case

The "Baltimore case," one of the nastiest and longest-running controversies in the swamps of scientific misconduct, goes to a government appeals board hearing on June 12, with a roster of 47 witnesses, including two opposing Nobel laureates, and at least 23 days scheduled for testimony. Originating in a disputed paper published in 1986, the case is steeped in personal animosities and starkly contrasting, if not perjurious, versions of the facts.

The Baltimore of the case is the 1975 Nobel laureate David Baltimore, of MIT, not charged with wrongdoing, but publicly identified with the marathon case because of his prominence and staunch defense of the person in the dock, a former research collaborator at MIT, Thereza Imanishi-Kari, of Tufts University. An immunologist of no great

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

Hope infuses the US's public position on providing money for the big particle accelerator, the Large Hadron Collider, Europe is planning to build at its CERN lab, near Geneva. But first, we've got to work out a long-range understanding for multi-national collaboration on these big machines, says White House S&T Advisor John Gibbons [SGR, May 15]. CERN Council President Hubert Curien recently told SGR that he received an extremely direct statement of position when he discussed the project at DOE headquarters in Washington: "They said they have no money," he reports.

Quit-and-tell stories have been rare so far in the Clinton Administration. Now comes one of the first, from Frank von Hippel, Princeton Professor of Public and International Affairs, who served 16 months as Assistant Director for National Security in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, and then quit last December. Writing in the newsletter of the Federation of American Scientists, von Hippel, a veteran arms-control advocate, acknowledges some success, but concludes: "Once I was inside the White House, I learned about 'turf'—and also that I had very little.... There is little opportunity inside the government to achieve fundamental changes in policy.... Any new ideas face a brutal obstacle course."

A new attack on the Space Station is being mobilized by Reps. Dick Zimmer (R-NJ) and Tim Roemer (D-Ind.), who two years ago came within one vote of terminating the project. The Congressmen, sponsors of HR 407, which would terminate the venture, are attacking the Space Station at its most vulnerable point—NASA's cost estimates, chimerical numbers which the General Accounting Office is examining at their request.

. . . Case Cost Baltimore Presidency of Rockefeller

(Continued from Page 1)

renown, she would have long ago sunk from public sight, if not for Baltimore's conspicuous association with her troubles.

The misnomered case has cost Baltimore dearly. In 1990, he was appointed President of Rockefeller University. When he arrived at the fabled "Rock," it was, as usual, a hotbed of internecine feuds unrelated to the big case. Baltimore was expected to restore peace and greatness. But the aroma of the Imanishi-Kari dispute followed him to that illustrious position. After a year on the job, he resigned under the hostile glares of faculty and trustees, who were fearful that the festering case, and its Congressional entanglements, might impede the flow of grants from Washington. Out went Baltimore, eventually returning to MIT.

Last November, after inquiries and investigations spread over six years, the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) found Imanishi-Kari guilty of 19 counts of faking and fabricating research data. The alleged offenses were linked to a purportedly breakthrough immunology paper she co-authored with Baltimore and others, published April 25, 1986, in *Cell*, and an NIH grant application on which she is accused of falsifying data. On the basis of its findings, ORI recommended Imanishi-Kari's banishment from federal research funding for 10 years—unusually harsh, as such things go.

Her challenge to the findings will be heard in Washington by the Research Integrity Adjudications Panel of the HHS Departmental Appeals Board, which has scheduled testimony from June 12 to 30 and from August 22 to September 1, and beyond, if necessary.

Sitting on the Panel will be two lawyer-members of the Appeals Board, Cecilia Sparks Ford and Judith Ballard, plus an academic scientist specially appointed for the case, Julius S. Youngner, Professor emeritus and former Chairman of the Department of Microbiology, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine. Youngner will participate as a full-fledged Panel member.

Imanishi-Kari is represented by one of the heavy hitters of the booming scientific-misconduct bar, Joseph Onek, who has bested the Office of Research Integrity in several previous prominent cases, including ORI's self-aborted pursuit of Robert Gallo on charges that he filched AIDS glory from the Pasteur Institute. ORI dropped the Gallo case in 1993 after the Appeals Board, relatively new on the misconduct circuit, stated evidentiary requirements that ORI felt it couldn't meet. The findings against Imanishi-Kari have been documented by ORI with its Gallo debacle in mind.

Soon after publication of the 1986 Baltimore-Imanishi-Kari *Cell* paper, the validity of several portions based on Imanishi-Kari's research were challenged by a post-doctoral fellow in her lab, Margot O'Toole, and the case was off and running for nearly a decade of inquiries in academe, investigations by the HHS Office of Research Integrity and its predecessors, and Congressional hearings.

O'Toole accused Baltimore, then head of the Whitehead Institute at MIT and the senior scientist on the NIH-supported project, of belittling and squelching her reservations about the paper. MIT, where Imanishi-Kari conducted her research, was accused by O'Toole's supporters of a once-over-lightly examination of her charges, as was Tufts, where Imanishi-Kari received an appointment just as the case went critical. Neither MIT nor Tufts found grounds for further pursuit of O'Toole's reservations about the paper.

The then-Director of NIH, James B. Wyngaarden, later chastised Baltimore, contending that if he had paid reasonable attention to O'Toole's questions about Imanishi-Kari's research, the episode could have been quickly resolved. O'Toole charged that her Cambridge immunology mentors blackballed her for suitable jobs because of her temerity in challenging a paper co-authored by Nobelist Baltimore.

Out of work, O'Toole persisted, picking up influential support among scientists who came to share her doubts, including Nobel laureate Walter Gilbert, who will testify against Imanishi-Kari, as, of course, will O'Toole. Also among O'Toole's backers were Ned Feder and Walter Stewart, of NIH, then at the beginning of their long run of self-initiated investigations of scientific misdeeds.

O'Toole was championed at a Congressional hearing in 1989 chaired by the then-high riding Rep. John Dingell, who said the case confirmed his suspicions of science's unwillingness to confront scientific misconduct. Baltimore and the irascible Chairman clashed head-on about the case. The Baltimore camp further incited the volatile Dingell with a nationwide letters-to-the-editor campaign accusing him of hostility to scientific freedom. Dingell was visibly enraged.

Major figures in the scientific community chose sides and numerous vile remarks were whispered and even published. Discussing the case in a letter in *Nature* in 1991, John Cairns, then at the Harvard School of Public Health, assailed the authors of the paper and stated, "About the only question remaining is whether anyone will actually go to jail...."

An early government investigation let Imanishi-Kari off with a slight reprimand for sloppy record keeping. But then O'Toole charged that Imanishi-Kari had fabricated lab notes

(Continued on Page 3)

© 1995, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher **Daniel S. Greenberg**
Associate Publisher **Wanda J. Reif**
Circulation Manager **Glen D. Grant**

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, $455.00 (two years, $780.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

. . . A Clash on How Imanishi-Kari Ran Her Laboratory

(Continued from Page 2)

to deceive the investigators. Dingell brought in Secret Service document specialists, who said Imanishi-Kari's lab records were fabricated long after the research was allegedly conducted.

In accordance with Appeals Board procedures, the opposing sides have filed lists of witnesses to be summoned—13 by the Office of Research Integrity and 34 by Imanishi-Kari—plus summaries of what they "may" or "will" discuss, in the words of the witness-list filings. The summaries provide some clues to the strategies that will be employed.

Baltimore, scheduled by the Imanishi-Kari legal team for three hours in the witness chair, is listed for testimony on general matters concerning the conduct of the research in question, "post-publication meetings concerning the *Cell* paper," and "the effect that space constraints imposed by scientific journals have on the description of experimental methods and results." The summary of Baltimore's testimony says little more.

The topic of journal space limitations is to be discussed by several other witnesses called by Imanishi-Kari, thus suggesting that deficiencies in the published paper will be attributed to "space constraints."

The Office of Research Integrity will field its own Nobel authority in the person of Walter Gilbert, 1980 recipient of the Nobel chemistry prize, and Professor of Cellular and Developmental Biology, at Harvard. Gilbert, according to the ORI summary, "may testify on the standards within the scientific community during the relevant time periods for the honest and accurate reporting of data in scientific publications and grant applications." The issue of standards is crucial, since the rules governing scientific misconduct at NIH and other Public Health Service agencies were adopted after the *Cell* paper was published.

Gilbert, who has previously criticized the *Cell* research, "may testify," according to the ORI summary, "that it is violative of the acceptable standards in the scientific community to report data that a researcher knows is not supported by other experiments the researcher has performed."

The preview of Gilbert's testimony is studded with negative assessments of Imanishi-Kari's portion of the *Cell* paper, charging that she "violated scientific standards for the honest and accurate reporting of research data" and that the data she reported "has been deliberately misrepresented and/or falsified to support the theories she sought to promote" in the paper. "Contrary data has been deliberately hidden from the reader," the Gilbert summary states.

Conflicting testimony is scheduled on Imanishi-Kari's working style and the atmosphere in her laboratory at MIT. Testifying for ORI will be Charles Maplethorpe, an MD-PhD, who worked in her lab from 1981-85, a period that includes the research reported in the *Cell* paper.

The summary states that Maplethorpe "will testify that Dr. Imanishi-Kari often refused to accept data that was contrary to her preconceived notions of the results she expected to obtain and that she frequently refused to share experimental results with others in the laboratory." Among other items in Maplethorpe's testimony: Imanishi-Kari's lab "worked independently of the Baltimore lab..."

Contrary reports on Imanishi-Kari's scientific style will be presented by several witnesses. Christopher Albanese, a co-author of the *Cell* paper, described in the summary as currently a lab assistant at the University of Chicago, "may testify that Respondent [Imanishi-Kari] was open to multiple interpretations of data and shared her data with others in the laboratory." Identical words are used to describe the testimony to be offered by Martina Boersch-Supan, described as having "first-hand knowledge" of the lab from 1981 to 1985, as well as by David Weaver, of the Dana Farber Cancer Center, and Moema Reis, co-authors of the paper, and Edward Reilly, of Abbott Laboratories.

ORI will call several Secret Service forensic specialists who reported that notebooks and counter tapes presented by Imanishi-Kari in support of her research were fabricated to appear contemporaneous with the conduct of the research.

Contesting their testimony will be several witnesses claiming familiarity with the lab facilities and operations, including Ward DeHaro, Operations Administrator at MIT. He will testify, the summary says, that when printers for gamma and beta counters broke down, they "were frequently switched informally without any record being kept."

Imanishi-Kari is scheduled for two days of testimony, during which, the summary says, she will discuss the performance of the experiments reported in the paper, and "testify about the atmosphere in her laboratory and her relationship with other scientists," including O'Toole and Maplethorpe.

Scheduled to testify for one day is Herman Eisen, Professor Emeritus of Immunology at MIT, who conducted the first inquiry into O'Toole's reservations about the *Cell* paper. His investigatory counterpart at Tufts, Henry Wortis, Professor of Pathology, is also scheduled for a full day of testimony.

Testifying, too, will be ORI Director Lyle Bivens, who, according to the summary, will explain that the proposed 10-year ban on grants for Imanishi-Kari "is not a punitive action, but is recommended in order to protect the public fisc [SGR editor's note: it's a real word] and the integrity of the Federally-funded research process." To be cited by Bivens is Imanishi-Kari's "lack of remorse as demonstrated by her long-standing refusal to acknowledge that there were any problems with the data at issue..." To which is added that Bivens doubts she can be trusted with federal grant money.

The case could be a make-or-break event for ORI, which has a woeful won-lost record when it comes to the big ones. The office has mustered few friends in the science establishment, and is often criticized as slow, arbitrary, confused, and inept. SGR hears that ORI has poured all it's got, scientifically and legally, into contesting Imanishi-Kari's challenge to its findings.—DSG

. . . NSF Head Sees Failure to Explain Social Sciences

(Continued from Page 1)

then turned to other matters, leaving the fate of the SBE programs in a semantic mist. Were they to be eliminated, or would they merely not share in the 3 percent growth planned for the non-SBE research? There is a difference.

The Budget Committee report that accompanies and presumably illuminates the numbers-packed Budget Resolution does not contribute to clarity on this subject. The report states:

"In order for the technological revolution to continue, a strong fundamental science is needed. Therefore, this proposal assumes that basic research should be prioritized. For instance, NSF civilian research and related activities, with the exclusion of social, behavioral, and economic studies and the Critical Technologies Institute, can be provided at their current levels plus 3 percent. No reductions are assumed to NSF basic research." Addressing other programs at NSF, the report continues, "Education and Human Resources can be maintained and Academic Research Infrastructure is assumed at President Clinton's requested level."

But nothing is explicitly said about terminating the SBE activities.

SGR's request for a clarification from Walker brought a response from the Legislative Director of the Science Committee, Christopher Wydler.

To achieve the 3 percent increase for the physical sciences within the bounds of the Budget Resolution, he said, SBE and the Technologies Institute "would have to be zeroed out." If there's any funding at all for SBE, he said, funding for the physical sciences would be negatively affected.

Was Walker advocating the end of the SBE programs?

Wydler replied, "I think he is strongly suggesting that he wants the issue addressed. Walker feels that SBE should have a lower priority."

Asked for specifics of where NSF had crossed into "politically correct" territory, Wydler demurred. But a lobbyist who spoke to another staff member told SGR that when he raised that question, the response was a roll of the eyes and a comment, "That's Bob," meaning Chairman Walker.

But Walker's views are not settled on this subject, the Legislative Director assured SGR, explaining that the Chairman is awaiting a recommendation from Rep. Steven Schiff (R-New Mexico), Chairman of the Science Subcommittee on Basic Research, which plans to hold hearings shortly after the Memorial Day weekend recess.

Meanwhile, protests of varying intensity are rolling in. Without saying anything about the SBE termination reports, NSF Director Lane adopted a blame-the-victim stance, lamenting to Walker in a letter dated May 22 that NSF has "not been more effective in informing the Congress about the importance played by the social, behavioral, and economic sciences in the Nation's basic research enterprise." With a productive record from the early days of NSF, Lane continued, the social sciences are an integral part of the Foundation's mission to keep America on the frontiers of research.

Specific achievements that laymen can understand are called for in such circumstances, and Lane provided several. "For example," his letter stated, "recent discoveries on human thinking processes, neurobiology, and machine computational processes have stimulated important new work that will advance computer design and understanding of human cognition." Lane added that NSF-supported research in economics yielded insights that were used by the Federal Communications Commission in its multi-billion-dollar auctions of the electromagnetic spectrum.

Stronger stuff came from the main Washington lobbying post of the social sciences, the Coalition of Social Science Associations, whose Executive Director, Howard Silver, issued a statement saying, "The House Budget Committee's action would decimate a cornerstone of our pursuit of knowledge." Silver referred to Walker's "politically correct" jibe as "an affront to the men and women who have devoted their lives to creating knowledge that enhances American life."

A letter to Walker from Alan Kraut, Executive Director of the American Psychological Society, said the elimination of NSF support for the social sciences "would be a tragic error." Kraut noted that "Almost from the beginning of NSF, social, behavioral and economic research has been seen as central to the Agency's mission, a sentiment that continues at the highest levels of NSF today."

Though the $85 million for the SBE Directorate is one of the lesser entries in the Foundation's $3.2-billion budget, it's essential to the survival of the disciplines. If NSF drops out, they would fall into penury, a state they have known from time to time as sentiments about social-science research have shifted with the political tides.

Republicans tend to look with suspicion upon this kind of research, which was severely slashed during the Reagan Administration. Aware of a lurking hostility, NSF discreetly steers clear of anything that's too gooey, and is also mindful of the risks of project titles that might lend themselves to ridicule. Even so, the social sciences must endure political scrutiny unknown elsewhere in NSF's research portfolio.

There's another problem: Though allegations of intellectual softness in the social sciences have lessened in recent years, they are far from absent among so-called hard scientists. In 1993, for example, NIH Director Harold Varmus, a physician-virologist, inflamed the social scientists in his orbit by telling the *New York Times*, "And while I'm trying to learn more about behavioral science, I must say that I don't feel that I get tremendous intellectual stimulation from most of the things I read."

Is the termination of NSF programs in the social, behavioral, and economics sciences a real possibility? It seems unthinkable, in view of the heavy and growing reliance of government and industry on research and applications in these fields. But impulses and votes are strong in this Congress for doing the unthinkable.

Varmus and Mental Health Council Have a Bad Day

Meeting with the Advisory Council of the National Institute of Mental Health on May 23, NIH Director Harold Varmus employed no circumlocutions in explaining the delay in filling the top post at NIMH, vacant for over a year. He left some Council members fuming, not least for hurrying in, announcing he could spare only 10 minutes, and then rushing off.

"All I can tell you at the moment," Varmus said, "is that we do not have a candidate to whom we are prepared to offer the position." The search, he said, will be continued by a reconstituted search committee. "Frankly I read the story in *Science* [of May 5]," he said, referring to a news article about the long-running search, "but I do not consider it a criticism to be told that we are aiming too high. I intend to get an extremely accomplished person who will fight for your values and your science at all levels, and we will do that this year. So I would rather wait than settle.

"I also have no shame," Varmus said, "in insisting that this person be highly competent in all areas of modern biology, ranging from clinical to fundamental [and] genetic aspects of what you do.... I am mainly thinking about people who are not quite as prominent, but who have energy, zeal, knowledge, and an ability to lead.... This is the first search that has given me so much difficulty. But I am going to persist until we get someone who will not simply satisfy, because we have had many good candidates.... But I have not yet found the leader for the next 10 years, and that is what I need, and I will do it," Varmus declared.

Among those attending the meeting was the Acting Director of NIMH, Rex William Cowdry, a candidate for the directorship.

Asked by Council members for more details about the search, Varmus said he felt there may have been "undue emphasis on those people who were already prominent." The renewed search, he continued, would "look for people who may be outstanding associate professors, new full professors, people who are not professors at all, who do not quite have the name recognition that others do."

Earlier a member of the Advisory Council, Jose Szapocznik, a psychologist at the University of Miami School of Medicine, said he had heard that the new search committee does not contain "minority scientists" from outside of NIH and that "the number of behavioral scientists and social scientists has been reduced in the outside group."

Szapocznik's concern was taken up by another Council member, Kathryn Suzanne Cameron Porter, an anthropologist, whose husband, Rep. John Porter (R-Ill.), chairs the House Appropriations Subcommittee for NIH.

"If I could just second Jose's comment about having people on the [search] Committee who can bring perspectives that might be relevant in terms of gender and in terms of the social sciences," Porter said, "I think that would be very positive.

"There is a great concern out there," she continued, "that those people are not being talked to and that they have not the access. As an applied anthropologist myself," she said, "I want to emphasize that."

"Okay, we'll make sure that gets pushed," Varmus replied, pointing out the presence on the search committee of Norman Anderson, a Duke University psychologist, recently appointed as the first Director of NIH's Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research. Noting that Anderson, who is black, is "both minority ... and, of course, a social scientist," Varmus said Anderson "will have the ability to network with all of the social science organizations to be sure that we are doing a very careful job in looking for everyone who might be in a corner somewhere."

Regarding Anderson, Szapocznik responded that, as a member of the NIH management, Anderson is "now an insider. It is important to have in the outside group a minority and a behavioral scientist representation."

Whereupon, Varmus said he must leave and did. Acting Director Cowdry said, "Okay. We knew that was going to be a necessarily brief visit because of his other commitments."

SGR hears that Dr. Porter has requested a meeting with the NIH Director.

Gloom on Budget Front

Miraculous escapes have often been the outcome for research budgets in otherwise harsh seasons on Capitol Hill. But don't count on it this time, despite the appearance of divine intervention in behalf of NIH.

NIH remains far from fiscal nirvana, while the bulk of the federal research system can properly share in the lament raised by NASA Chief Dan Goldin, who said the House budget plan puts his agency on a "road to disaster."

NIH got a toehold on a reprieve last week when the Senate voted, 85-14, to amend its budget resolution in favor of cutting only $1 billion rather than $8 billion from Bethesda's funds through the year 2002. Considering the choice, NIH was pleased, though Director Harold Varmus pointed out, in a telephone call to SGR, that the budget plan makes no allowance for the bite of inflation over the next six years.

Bad enough, but hidden in the din of budget battling was another indication that research can't count on the belief in its worth that has so often worked wonders. On May 24, Sen. James Exon (D-Neb.) introduced a "Sense of the Senate" resolution titled "On the importance of research, technology, and trade promotion and trade law enforcement programs."

Lauding research as a pillar of prosperity, the resolution opposed any tax reductions that would cut into federal support in this area. Speaking in behalf of the resolution, Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) said the budget plan "will reduce civilian research and technology programs to a four-decade low as a percentage of GDP and federal spending."

No matter. When the pro-research resolution came to a vote, it went down, 53-47, along party lines.

APA Buys Legal Peace With $80,000 Settlement

With an $80,000 payment to cover his past legal fees, the American Psychological Association has headed off the threat of a law suit by Professor Lewis Lipsitt of Brown University, a distinguished psychologist whose run for the Association's presidency in 1994 was openly resisted by the APA senior staff [SGR, June 1, 1994: "Venomous Accusations Mark Election at Psychology Assn."]

Many APA members protested the staff involvement in the election, and some resigned, charging dirty dealing by the hired hands at the Association. Lipsitt told SGR that he estimates the APA spent over $250,000 on legal costs in his case before agreeing to the $80,000 settlement, which was signed on May 12. The APA General Counsel, James McHugh, told SGR the APA's legal costs were "high, but not that high." Based in Washington, the APA numbers some 67,000 full-fledged members, plus 60,000 affiliates and students, and about 500 fulltime employes. It's one of the biggest and richest professional associations.

Lipsitt, Professor of Psychology and Medical Science at Brown University, has been a member of APA for over 40 years, and is the winner of numerous professional awards.

In 1990, while on a two-year leave from Brown to head up the APA's troubled Science Directorate, he was accused of harassment by women in the Directorate. Lipsitt denied the charges, but the women persisted, and the APA senior staff expressed fears of costly litigation.

In 1991, with the complaints continuing, Lipsitt signed an agreement with the APA that ended his job there, but continued his salary of $150,000 a year for the duration of his two-year leave. The agreement, however, required him to stay out of the APA building, unless invited, which he wasn't. In effect, he was declared an outcast. But Lipsitt had his own plans for continuing his long relationship with the APA.

Back at Brown in 1993, he qualified as a candidate for the APA presidency. The APA management seemed unconcerned and apparently took no part in the election, in which Lipsitt came in second in a field of five. In 1994, he ran again. This time, his chances looked better, and the APA went to Federal District Court to keep him off the ballot, on the grounds that he had agreed to stay away.

But noting that the termination date on the keep-out agreement was ambiguous and that Lipsitt's 1993 presidential race had gone unchallenged by the APA, the judge ruled that he could remain a candidate. The APA responded with one-sided accounts of the harassment charges in the APA membership's newspaper, *APA Monitor*.

In his second run for the presidency, even with the overt opposition of the APA's inner circle, he again came in second. The internal politics of the routinely tumultuous APA then become even frothier. More members resigned, defecting to the research-oriented American Psychological Society, a 1988 breakaway from the APA spawned by tensions between the predominant practitioner wing and academic researchers. As balm to the scientists, the APA later decided to spend an extra $500,000 on scientific activities.

Following long negotiations, the $80,000 settlement ends Lipsitt's threat of a law suit against the APA. The amount, he told SGR last week, falls about $40,000 short of his total legal bills. He also says he remains a strong supporter of APA, and though he has no plans at present, does not rule out another run for the APA presidency.

NSF Reviewing S&T Centers

Two studies are in progress to help the National Science Foundation determine the future of its Science and Technology Centers program, founded in 1989 and now providing funds for 25 centers at universities around the country. The centers, designed to support long-term, multi-disciplinary research, received a total of $60 million from NSF last year, including some funds provided by other federal agencies.

Now limited to a maximum of 11 years of support per center, the program is undergoing a review by the Washington-based National Academy of Public Administration. Mandated by NSF's Senate Appropriations Subcommittee last year, the Academy report is due this month. Also in the works is a study by Abt Associates, of Cambridge, Mass., which is due in March. That study will be reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences.

Meanwhile, NSF recently announced five-year renewals for 9 of the centers and interim renewals for two others for which further reviews were recommended.

NAS PhD Rating Due in Sept.

Where's that million-dollar nationwide ranking of doctoral programs in the sciences, engineering, and humanities, long in preparation at the National Academy of Sciences? Last October, SGR was told that it would be out in January or February. Then delays of another month or two were reported. The latest is that the manuscript has virtually made it through the Academy's nit-picking review process and will be published around "the beginning of September."

The document, titled *Report on Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States*, is the first of its kind from the Academy since 1982, and is eagerly awaited because of its authoritative source. Unlike the schlocky academic ratings put out by pop magazines, the Academy rankings are derived from a wealth of data, including faculty reports, scholarly publication records, financial standings, and status of research facilities. A high rating from the Academy can be a golden endorsement in the grants sweepstakes, while a middling score can inspire doubts about the quality of faculty, programs, and institutional leadership.

In addition to some of the Academy's own money, support for the study was provided by the Andrew Mellon, Ford, Sloan, and Hewlett Foundations—all reportedly interested in guidance on where they're putting their money.

In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

From the White House, National Science and Technology Council:

High Performance Computing and Communications (HPCC): Foundation for America's Information Future (138 pp., no charge), described as a "supplement to the President's FY 1996 Budget," which went to Congress last February for the fiscal year beginning next October 1, this is a guidebook to the government-wide planning and construction of the "information highway" and related high-tech endeavors. Work in the various participating agencies is described, along with budgets and timetables, and contacts are listed for obtaining more information. The report is available, with hypertext links, on the HPCC's World Wide Web home page, whose URL is: http//www.hpcc.gov/

Order the paper version from: National Coordination Office for High Performance Computing and Communications, Building 38A, B1-N30, 8600 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Md. 20894; tel. 301/402-4100; fax 301/402-4080; e-mail: nco@hpcc.gov

---

From the Medical Research Council of Canada:

Report of the President: 1993-1994 (38 pp., no charge), tells where the MRC, counterpart of the granting side of the US National Institutes of Health, awarded $258 million (Canadian) in the year ending March 31, 1994. An introduction by MRC President Henry Friesen says the Council funded 25 percent of new grant applicants and 65 percent of renewals, about the same as in the previous year. While the MRC budget has doubled over the past decade, he reports, the MRC's contribution to health-research funding has declined from 40 percent to 25 percent of the national total as the roles of provincial governments and health charities have increased. In disciplinary allocations among nearly 2000 grants awarded to individuals and groups, the neurosciences were tops, with 14.9 percent of the total, followed by cardiovascular research, 9.9 percent, and biochemistry, 8.4 percent. The report is in English and French.

Order from: Medical Research Council of Canada, Holland Cross, Tower B, 5th Floor, 1600 Scott Street, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A OW9; tel. 613/954-1972; fax 613/954-6653; e-mail: mrcinfocrm@hpb.hwc.ca

---

From the National Science Foundation, no charge:

Teacher Preparation and NSF Collaboratives for Excellence in Teacher Preparation: FY 1993 and 1994 Awards (NSF 95-73; 30 pp.), summaries of projects supported by NSF's Division of Undergraduate Education to improve teacher education programs on a state or regional basis, plus projects focused on a single course or series of courses. Six broad-area programs were financed in 1993-94, under plans to support three to five projects a year, at $500,000 to $1 million each annually, for up to five years.

Order from: NSF, Publications, Room P-15, Arlington, Va. 22230; tel. 703/306-1130; fax 703/644-4278.

From the World Resources Institute (WRI):

Environmental Indicators: A Systematic Approach to Measuring and Reporting on Environmental Policy Performance in the Context of Sustainable Development (43 pp., $14.95, plus $3.50 for shipping), calls for worldwide yardsticks of environmental problems and progress in reducing them. The object is to turn "mountains of data into a set of simple, significant, and user-friendly tools." Cited are a Canadian system of indicators and a Dutch program that collects data and presents them in a "composite pollution index."

Order from: WRI Publications, PO Box 4852, Hampden Station, Baltimore, Md. 21211; tel. 1-800/822-0504 or 410/516-6963; fax 410/516-6998.

From the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), no charge:

Delivering Results: A Progress Report from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (69 pp.), upbeat descriptions likely to be essential reference material for obituaries of NIST's Advanced Technology Program and other schemes marked for abolition on Capitol Hill.

Order from: NIST, Public Affairs, Room A-903, Building 101, Gaithersburg, Md. 20899-0001; tel. 301/975-2762; fax 301/926-1630.

From the US Bureau of Mines:

US Bureau of Mines Minerals and Materials Information (USBM #SP 2-95; GPO Stock No. 024-004-02413-5 $14, $17.50 foreign), CD-ROM with commodity summaries, industrial reviews, industry surveys, news reports, etc. This is the third disk in a series that will come out quarterly. For information on electronic access: tel. 202/501-0406.

Order from: New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, PO Box 371954, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15250-7954; tel. 202/512-1800; fax 202/512-2250.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, $455.00 ☐
two years, $780.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, $35.00 per year; non-USA surface mail, $15.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill
Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account#_____ Exp.date_____

_____
Signature

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

From the General Accounting Office (GAO):

NASA Budgets: Gap Between Funding Requirements and Projected Budgets Has Been Reopened (GAO/NSIAD-95-155BR; 33 pp., no charge), cites a wide financial gulf between NASA's long-term programs and the pared-down five-year budget allocations proposed by the White House. The GAO says NASA will fall short by at least $5 billion—a figure calculated before the Congressional Budget Committees proposed bigger reductions. With a current space budget of about $14 billion, Clinton aims to get down to $13 billion over 5 years, while the Republicans are shooting for $11 billion. Though cutting virtually all other programs in space, both the White House and Congress have ruled out reductions for the politically entrenched Space Station, budgeted next year for $2.1 billion. But the sacrosanct celestial turkey faces mounting Congressional opposition as the space agency crumbles away. NASA's latest five-year plan, announced last week, calls for eliminating 3500 staff positions and at least 20,000 contractor jobs. Included is a long list of earlier GAO reports on the woeful topic of space and money.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

From the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA):

US-Russian Cooperation in Space (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01410-6; 130 pp., $10), says the US has reaped technological and foreign-policy gains from collaboration with the ex-Soviet space establishment. But OTA warns that the benefits come with risks of Russian failures that could seriously interfere with the centerpiece of the partnership, the Space Station. NASA's purchases of $650 million in Russian goods and services during 1994-97, OTA estimates, will be "by far the largest transfer of US public funds to the Russian government and private organizations..." OTA says the collaboration creates jobs for many Russian engineers and technicians, "thereby inhibiting proliferation through 'brain drain' " and sustaining the US-Russian agreement on missile controls. Overall, OTA concludes that the collaboration is worthwhile for the US, but not by a wide margin. Ray Williamson of the OTA staff served as Project Director for the report. (A four-page summary is available from OTA without charge: 202/224-8996.)

Order the full report from: New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, PO Box 371954, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15250-7954; tel. 202/512-1800; fax 202/512/2250.

For instructions on receiving OTA reports by various electronic means: OTA Telecommunications and Information Systems Office: tel. 202/228-6000.

(Continued on Page 7)

From the Science Policy Research Division of the Congressional Research Service (CRS), part of the Library of Congress, no charge:

DOD's Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) (95-489 SPR; 6 pp.), presents the declining vital statistics of the Pentagon's network of think tanks and free-standing labs, down from 39 in the 1960s to just 12 this year. Among the better-known survivors are RAND, the Institute for Defense Analysis, the Lincoln Lab, and MITRE. The report, by Michael E. Davey, notes that Congress has been squeezing the system, capping FFRDC pay last year at $148,500, which could cut some salaries by 40-45 percent. Public and private research organizations are described as concerned about expansionism by sheltered FFRDCs looking for post-Cold War markets. The report, focused on DOD, observes that six other federal agencies operate a total of 30 FFRDCs, with the whole batch budgeted in 1994 for $5.4 billion, 8 percent of total federal R&D.

Research and Development Funding in the US Department of Agriculture (95-525 SPR; 10 pp.), reviews recent budget trends in USDA research—between steady state and slumping—and summarizes some of the many doubts and dissatisfactions about the extension system, priorities in research, the scale of competitive grants, attention to the social and behavioral sciences, etc. The report is by Christine M. Matthews.

Infectious Diseases: Emerging and Reemerging Threats to Public Health in the United States (95-534 SPR; 28 pp.), cautions about complacency toward infectious diseases, of which it presents a long list, including cholera, Lyme disease, encephalitis, dengue and yellow fever, and influenza. Noting financial strains at the Centers for Disease Control, the author, Judith A. Johnson, observes, "Society often finds it difficult to cope with threats, such as those to public health, which seem distant or far off in the future..." Favorable references and extensive quotations are accorded a 1992 report by the Institute of Medicine, *Emerging Infections: Microbial Threats to Health in the United States* (National Academy Press: tel. 1-800/624-6242 or 202/334-3313).

Hydrogen: Technology and Policy (95-540 SPR; 21 pp.), respectfully discusses the potential of hydrogen as a commonly used fuel, a subject that would normally be filed with perpetual motion and spontaneous generation, except that Chairman Bob Walker (R-Pa.) of the House Science Committee is a hydrogen enthusiast and author of the Hydrogen Future Act of 1995 (HR 655), which recently passed the House. The hydrogen report, by Daniel Morgan and Fred Sissine, summarizes studies of cost, storage methods, safety, and application to fuel cells and other technologies.

Order these reports through a House or Senate member. Senate switchboard, 202/224-3121; House, 202/225-3121. Cite the Congressional Research Service as the source, with report title and number.